REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 8, 14, 20, 24, 26, 28, and 32 have been amended. Claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 have been cancelled. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102: The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, 14-18, 20, 22-24, 26-29, 31-34, 36, and 38 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pub. 2002/0143915 to Mathieson in view of USPN 6,762,857 issued to Salgado.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment and, as amended, recites the following acts:

1. A method for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment, comprising:
2. placing production data received from a client in a queue, the production data including production options for a target document identified by the client;
3. generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing production data held in the queue, the production data to be delivered to one of a plurality of production devices;
4. presenting the queue interface to the client;
5. generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface; and
6. presenting the status interface to the client.

Claim 1 includes one or more acts not taught by Mathieson and Salgado – individually and combined. In short Claim 1 recites presenting a queue interface, generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/901,974   -11-

queue interface, and then presenting the status interface. Mathieson and Salgado even when combined do not teach or suggest this.

Prior to the amendment of Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Mathieson taught each act except that it did not teach production data that includes print options for a target document. For this deficiency, the Examiner relied on Salgado. The Examiner equates Mathieson's user interface (16) with both the queue interface and the status interface recited in Claim 1. Mathieson's user interface (16) is illustrated in Mathieson, Fig. 3 which is reproduced below.

FIG.3

Claim 1 recites that the status interface is generated for a production service selected through the queue interface. The status interface of Claim 1 is different than the queue interface. As illustrated, Mathieson's user interface (16) is a single user interface that includes status data (32). However this status data (16) is not generated for a chosen production device that is selected though a separate queue interface. Mathieson's user interface (16) simply does not allow for the selection of a production device.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Mathieson and Salgado as are Claims 2-3 and 5-7 which depend from Claim 1. Claim 4 has been cancelled.

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/901,974   -12-

Claim 8 like Claim 1 recites presenting a queue interface, generating a status interface for a production device selected through the queue interface, and then presenting the status interface. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 8 and Claims 9 and 11-13 which depend from Claim 8. Claim 10 has been cancelled.

Claim 14 is directed to a computer program product for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment. The product includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 14 and Claims 15 and 17-19 which depend from Claim 14.

Claim 20 is directed to a computer program product for mediating access to production devices. The product includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for implementing the method of Claim 8. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable, so are Claim 20 and Claims 21 and 23-25 which depend from Claim 20. Claim 22 was cancelled.

Claim 26 is directed to a system for providing queue management and production device status and recites elements for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 26 and Claims 27-31 which depend from Claim 26.

Claim 32 is directed to a system for providing queue management and production device status and recites the following elements for implementing the method of Claim 8. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable, so are Claim 32 and Claims 33-38 which depend from Claim 32.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103: The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 7, 9, 13, 19, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 37 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson in view of Salgado in further view of US Pub 2003/0005097 to Barnard.

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/901,974   -13-

Claims 3 and 7 depend from Claim 1 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable; so are Claims 3 and 7.

Claims 9 and 13 depend from Claim 8 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable; so are Claims 9 and 13.

Claim 19 depends from Claim 14 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 14 is patentable, so is Claim 19.

Claims 21 and 25 depends from Claim 20 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 20 is patentable, so are Claims 21 and 25.

Claim 30 depends from Claim 26 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 26 is patentable, so is Claim 30.

Claims 35 and 37 depend from Claim 32 and include all the limitations of that base Claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 32 is patentable, so are Claims 35 and 37.

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/901,974   -14-

CONCLUSION: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the   ⁊

outstanding Office Action.   :

Respectfully submitted,

Shell Sterling Simpson, et al.

By _____

Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

December 1, 2005

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/901,974   -15-